

in 15 years? Or do you think that we should treat Iran the same way that we are treating Russia?

So I submit that to my colleagues, and I invite them to maybe engage on that question because that is what this motion is about: Do you stand with Russia? Or do you stand with preventing U.S. businesses from doing business with a country that our intelligence community has said has tried to undermine our elections?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Well, America, you just heard a ridiculous straw-man choice laid out in front of you.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about anything other than selling and financing aircraft sales to Iran. That is what this bill is about. This is what this bill should be about.

I will point out to my colleague that there are some pretty major kinetic activities—I believe they are called at this point, which means shooting war—happening in Mosul and other places where our troops are involved.

But at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this motion to recommit. I look forward to working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address concerns that we may have with other foreign governments in the future, and I would request that they vote for the underlying bill, H.R. 5711.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this letter is to inform you that I have sent a letter to California

Governor Jerry Brown informing him that I am resigning my position as the United States Representative for the 44th Congressional District of California effective Sunday, December 4, 2016.

In November, I was elected by the people of Los Angeles County to serve as County Supervisor for District 4. It has been a privilege to serve the residents of California in the House of Representatives for the last five and a half years. I have worked to build a better future for our state and country.

I also want to thank you Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House. I have enjoyed working with you and my colleagues during my time in Congress. I look forward to continuing our work together in order to build a better country.

Sincerely,

JANICE HAHN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2016.

Hon. EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California,
Sacramento, CA.

DEAR GOVERNOR BROWN, in November, I was elected by the residents of Los Angeles County to serve as Supervisor for District 4. I am hereby resigning my position as the United States Representative for the 44th District of California effective Sunday, December 4, 2016.

It has been a privilege to serve the residents of California in the House of Representatives for the last five and a half years. I have worked to build a better future for our state and country.

I also want to thank you and your administration as well as my colleagues in California's Congressional delegation. I have enjoyed working with you and them during my time in Congress. I look forward to continuing this important work for the residents of Los Angeles County.

Sincerely,

JANICE HAHN,
Member of Congress.

TRADE'S IMPACT ON AMERICAN WORKERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we in the industrial Midwest and Great Lakes heartland know firsthand why the Presidential election was so hard fought and close in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Our reasoning has endured a grim reality with a decades-long economic struggle to produce good jobs with good wages and benefits, but what we have experienced is a continuous outsourcing of millions of jobs to penny-wage sweatshops in Mexico, China, Bangladesh, and beyond. To the people of America's heartland, it feels like jobs are being moved just about everywhere but into the Midwest and Great Lakes.

Daily we witness trainloads of imports flooding into our Nation, as closed and protected markets abroad block mutual exchange of exports. America hasn't had balanced trade accounts for three decades, and workers in those nations struggle to survive on measly wages and without spare cash

cannot buy much of what they produce anyway.

Meanwhile, pink-slipped U.S. workers have endured a painful toll—annual wages now \$7,000 less per year on average in northern Ohio—while the cost of education expenses, health care, and everyday life rise and further squeeze pocketbooks.

Please don't tell us robots took the jobs.

This daily reality was the major backdrop to this recent election and deserves closer attention in the coming days. America's trade policy must result in trade balances, new jobs here, and preferably trade surpluses for our country, not job loss. That policy must be fashioned on the fundamental value of free and fair trade among free people.

“NONE OF THE ABOVE”—THE CURE FOR WHAT AILS US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through a terrible and traumatic experience in the last year called a U.S. Presidential election. I don't know how many countless people were utterly mortified by this whether or not their chosen candidate won. As it happened, the candidate whom I voted for lost last Tuesday, but I would be foolish if I ignored the fact that people all across America had a miserable, terrible experience with this Presidential election whether or not their candidate won or lost.

You ask yourself: How could that be? Why don't we cherish the opportunity to choose our national leader? How is it that we have been sucked into this negative vortex of hatred and vilification called choosing a President of the United States?

It seems utterly imponderable.

I was watching Saturday Night Live just a couple days before the election, and the not-Hillary actor and the not-Donald actor could agree on only one thing. This is what they said: “This whole election has been mean. Don't you guys feel gross all the time about this?”

They were speaking to us, not to each other. They were speaking to us, the American people. They are right. It is gross. But the question for us is very simple: Does it really have to be that way? Or could we somehow transform this into what it is supposed to be, an exhilarating jubilee revolving around choosing a leader who will make America a better place?

□ 1915

But you have to understand that we are in a deep, deep hole here. Both major Presidential candidates entered this campaign with deeply negative favorability ratings, so negative they

were in double digits. For the past 6 months, it has been a commonplace observation that both candidates were the most unpopular candidates in the history of Presidential polling—about as popular as getting a root canal on your birthday.

It has been 13 long years since the Gallup Poll indicated that most people in this country thought that the country was heading in the right direction, 13 years; some Republican leadership, some Democratic leadership, and it all ends up the same way. Most people think the country is heading in the wrong direction.

And it has been 13 years, not coincidentally, since the majority of Americans thought that Congress was doing a good job and approved of it. In fact, we reached a nadir during the government shutdown: only 16 percent of the country thought we were heading in the right direction, and only 9 percent of the country thought that Congress was doing a good job. I pointed out at the time, standing exactly where I am standing right now, that, according to recent polling, Congress was literally less popular than dog poop.

In one election after another, the voters feel completely ignored. Little or no effort is made to explain to them how their lives might be improved by any candidates running for office. It is all just an ad hominem personality-driven crap-storm. People feel that they are left to choose between the lesser of two evils. Well, take it from me, the choice between two evils is evil.

One sort of commonsense observation when you are left with two major candidates, both of whom are overwhelmingly unpopular, is that part of the problem we face is that almost 80 percent of the people who are in America and eligible to vote had no part in choosing the candidates. So maybe it should come as no surprise that we end up in a situation like this.

I did an interesting poll just 3 days before the election, a national poll, and let me show you what I found regarding how these candidates, the nominees of their parties, stacked up against other alternative opponents. Let me show you. Let's play fantasy politics for a few minutes.

If the matchup had been President Obama versus Donald Trump, President Obama would have won by 2 percent of the vote. If the matchup had been Bill Clinton versus Donald Trump, Bill Clinton would have won with 4 percent of the vote. If the matchup had been JOE BIDEN, the Vice President, versus Donald Trump, Biden would have won by 8 percent of the vote. And if the matchup had been BERNIE SANDERS versus Donald Trump, as reported in the Huffington Post recently, BERNIE SANDERS would have won by 12 percent of the vote.

Note one thing: every single alternative candidate performed better than the actual candidate who was the nominee of my party in these

matchups. Also note that you can't possibly attribute that only to the negativity of the campaign because, frankly, there have been a few hard knocks over the years against Barack Obama and against Bill Clinton and against JOE BIDEN and against BERNIE SANDERS.

Let's play some more fantasy politics. Let's look at alternative opponents against Hillary Clinton. Now, bear in mind that, according to the current results, although Hillary Clinton lost the Presidential election, she nevertheless won the popular vote by around 1 percent of the vote, as I speak to you tonight.

Let's take a look at what would have happened if she had been pitted against alternative Republican candidates. Hillary Clinton would have lost to TED CRUZ in the popular vote by 4 percent. Hillary Clinton would have lost to George W. Bush by 8 percent. She would have lost to MARCO RUBIO by 10 percent, Mitt Romney by 12 percent, and she would have lost to the Speaker of this House, PAUL RYAN, by 14 percent.

Again, note one thing that draws all of these matchups together: the fact that the candidate who actually was the nominee of his party would have done worse against any alternative opponent, and the candidate who would have been the nominee of her party would have done worse against any alternative opponent that was tested here.

Let's continue, just for those who are curious. If neither of the candidates had been nominated by their parties, we would have had some interesting matchups. I will just give you three examples here.

I told you already that Senator SANDERS would have defeated Donald Trump by 12 points. He would have defeated TED CRUZ by 10 points, and he would have defeated MARCO RUBIO by 4 points. Interesting matchups all.

But here is the thing. The fact is that the great majority of Americans had no choice at all in selecting the candidates who we ended up voting for. We might consider it somehow a good thing that 58 million Americans actually voted in the Presidential primaries, until we consider that 191 million Americans did not.

Our grievances as a country and our divisions are massive, deep, intractable, and widely shared. That makes me wonder whether we can declare our independence from a system that constantly and perpetually generates unappealing and, frankly, sometimes appalling alternatives. We can't go on like this. You know what I am talking about. As Leonard Cohen said, we all feel like our dog just died.

We have to change the way that we do politics in America. Now, I am not suggesting that we choose our leaders like the Athenians did. They chose their leaders by lottery. I am not suggesting that we adopt Jonathan Swift's suggestions, but I agree with him that

people are the riches of a nation. And I am not going to suggest sitting it out. I realize the temptation. I have heard so many people say over the years, "Don't vote; it only encourages them," but I think that is wrong.

What we need is a better political system that actually manifests itself in a positive way and leads to a choice between candidates whom—imagine—we respect, we admire, we look up to as they engage in a battle of ideas and principles, not a battle of personalities and personal attacks.

I am also not going to suggest that the answer would be a third party. If there is one thing that is clear, the two parties we have aren't functioning that well. I am not sure that a third party is likely to make much of a difference.

And I don't think that we are likely to see a messiah running for the third party as a Presidential candidate when one we had this year couldn't even tell us what "a leppo" was. It is a good thing nobody asked him, "What's a henway?" The answer is 4 to 6 pounds.

I think what is missing, after giving this a great deal of thought for the past week, is something very simple. We Americans desperately need and deserve the right to reject all of the candidates on the ballot.

Now, I realize that that is an unusual notion, but I want you to think about it because I am introducing a bill called the None of the Above Act, whereby, if the last line on the ballot, "none of the above," gets more votes than any candidate does, then "none of the above" actually wins. I am not talking about the Nevada version that we already have where the "none of the above" vote gets ignored. I am talking about "none of the above" winning and forcing a mulligan, a do-over. We make them do it over until they get it right and give us candidates whom we want to vote for, someone who we feel will actually do a good job in leadership and make the country a better place.

Now, I want you to know that this is not unprecedented. I want you to know that in Communist Poland, "none of the above," actually crossing the candidate's name off the ballot, which is a version of "none of the above," defeated the Prime Minister in 1989. In 1991, 200 candidates for the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies were defeated the same way.

If the end of communism isn't enough to motivate you for favoring this reform, here are some more benefits:

First and most importantly, we eliminate the need, the terrible need, to try to choose between the lesser of two evils. Remember the Louisiana Governor's race 25 years ago when we were forced to choose in Louisiana between corrupt Edwin Edwards and racist David Duke? Do you remember the bumper stickers that said, "Vote for the crook. It's important"?

According to a poll at that time, two-thirds of Louisiana voters wished they could have voted for neither, for "none

of the above.” And they were right. They were right. If primary voters haven’t identified the best candidates for the job—not just decent candidates, but actually the best candidates for the job—the general election voters should be able to wave their fingers and say: Uh-uh, no way. I am not going for that until you convince we, the people, that you are the best candidate for the job, and we are going to insist on other choices until we find somebody who is.

Now, this will have a wonderful effect, a very important effect, on what we saw drenching us, the tsunami of negative advertising and negative campaigning that we saw on our TV screens and now on our computer screens and even our phones, this incessant drumbeat of negative campaigning. Why? Because both sides will understand that, if you indulge yourself that way, all you are doing is driving down votes below “none of the above” and elevating “none of the above” above your candidate.

Let’s replace this terrible malignant notion of vote against him/vote against her with something called vote for me—and here is why. Here is what I will do to improve your life. What am I going to do for you, not what am I going to do to you.

Now, in addition to that, I see a big boost in turnout. Last time I checked, which was a few days ago, the total number of votes in the 2016 Presidential election was lower than the total number of votes in the 2012 Presidential election and the 2008 Presidential election and the 2004 Presidential election. As of a few days ago, you had to go all the way back to 2000 to find any national Presidential election where fewer people voted. And here is the really strange thing: back in 2000, we had 40 million fewer Americans.

I think there are a lot of people who will show up for the specific purpose of voting for “none of the above.” I think we will see a massive increase in turnout if we simply convey to people the right to reject all the candidates, which is exactly how they feel.

In addition to that, we will be keeping elected officials on their toes. Ninety percent of the elected officials in this body, the House of Representatives, face uncompetitive races time after time after time. Two-thirds of all the races down the hall in the Senate are uncompetitive. When Members of Congress represent deep red or deep blue districts, they often run unopposed and they win with 100 percent of the so-called vote, which isn’t really a vote at all.

So knowing that, no matter what kind of district they are—red, blue, purple—no matter whom they represent, they will be facing “none of the above” on that ballot will put the fear of God in them. We need to do that. We need to make sure that the comfortable here in this room and down the hall aren’t too comfortable, and that even pampered incumbents in ger-

rymandered districts would have to work diligently to defeat the specter of “none of the above.”

□ 1930

Also, we clearly need to defeat the dictatorship of the primary voters. As I indicated before, 58 million American adults voted in the primary elections, and 191 million did not. What was the result of that? People who were deeply dissatisfied with the choices that they had. Let me show you what I mean.

Two days before the Presidential election, I asked in a national poll: How do you feel about those Presidential primary elections? How do you feel about them?

Almost 52 percent said they were disappointed. Only 48 percent said that they were pleased. Interestingly enough, that sentiment of disappointment was widely shared. Among Democrats, 38 percent said that they were disappointed. Among Republicans, 53 percent said that they were disappointed. Among Independents, who, in many States, didn’t even have the legal right to vote to choose a Presidential candidate in either party, 69 percent said that they were disappointed. That explains, in part, why we end up with a terrible Hobson’s choice on the ballot.

Above all, though, to be able to choose “none of the above” on each Federal ballot would show respect for the voters. In my State—the State of Florida—the Constitution of the State begins with these words: “All political power is inherent with the people.” If you really believe that in your heart—if you believe that the sovereign in this country, the royalty in this country are the people of the United States, the voters—then how can you possibly explain to them why we wouldn’t allow them to reject all of the candidates?

This is a practical proposal. I don’t know how many people have noticed this, but we have more than 2 months between the election and when the President is sworn in under the 20th Amendment. We have almost 2 months between the election and when the House of Representatives and the Senate are sworn in here in this building. It is not that difficult to put on a new election within 2 months. I know a lot of people who would favor having elections that take place in less than 2 months instead of approaching 2 years. In fact, it would be a blessed relief.

Now, I understand that most people who are elected officials would want to fight against this for their own selfish purposes. In fact, one of the liberating elements is the fact that I will be leaving this body in a couple of months. I will be leaving because I was defeated. I will be leaving this body, and that gives me the freedom to be able to do and say what is right and not what is for my own personal benefit.

I will point out that many, many, many people across the country believe that term limits are a good thing and that, somehow or another, term limits

have been maneuvered through the Florida legislature and the legislatures of many other States. And, of course, term limits limit the terms of elected officials. In the same sense, if term limits can ever be enacted anywhere, that shows that it is possible to actually put a choice on the ballot like “none of the above” that doesn’t favor any elected official anywhere—ever—but favors, instead, the voters and gives them a right that they should have but that they don’t have.

In case you are curious, you may wonder what would have happened a week ago last Tuesday if we had had that choice on the ballot. I know, and I would like to show you.

According to my poll, 40 percent of the American people would have voted a week ago last Tuesday for “none of the above.” If you were to delve further into it, you would see, of those 60 percent, 28 percent would have voted for Hillary Clinton; 27 percent would have voted for Donald Trump; 4 percent would have voted for the third-party candidate put up by the Libertarians; and 1 percent would have voted for the third-party candidate put up by the Green Party.

In short, think about what this really means. “None of the above” would have won, and we would have had the choice that human dignity suggests we should have—a choice involving new candidates to decide who rules over this Nation of 300 million-plus people and becomes the leader of the free world—a new set of choices, a better set of candidates, and a brighter future.

If we simply can’t stand the candidates we have got, we need new ones. Isn’t that obvious? Think of it as voting with your middle finger. We deserve this choice. As human beings, as Americans—as people who deserve to have full control over our own sovereign fate—we deserve the choice of “none of the above.”

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A PERILOUS MOMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, our country is facing a perilous moment. In my district, parents are reassuring frightened children that everything will be all right. That is what parents do. Our job as Members of Congress is to do the best we can to make sure that those reassurances come true.

Madam Speaker, I was born and raised in Chicago. In 2000, I voted for the first time in my life. I voted for Barack Obama to serve in this Chamber. While he did not win that election, I was inspired by his message of reform, change, and hope. Throughout his life and career, Barack Obama has always tried to bring people together.